DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 279 045 CS 505 510

AUTHOR Chmielewski, Terrence L.
TITLE Communicator Motivation: Toward Conceptualization and Measurement.
PUB DATE Nov 86
NOTE 43p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (72nd, Chicago, IL, November 13-16, 1986).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Affective Measures; Altruism; Attitude Measures; Cognitive Measurement; *Communication Research; Egocentrism; Higher Education; *Interpersonal Communication; Interpersonal Competence; *Measurement Techniques; *Motivation; Personality Measures; Psychometrics; Questioning Techniques; Questionnaires; Self Concept Measures; Speech Communication
IDENTIFIERS *Communicator Motivation; Communicator Style

ABSTRACT

A study operationalized and measured the construct of communicator motivation, defined as an affective tendency to approach and become involved in communication, as part of an effort to clarify the concept and to begin validation of a new scale to measure it. The study addressed two specific motives: concern for promoting self and concern for promoting other. The Communicator Motivation (COMMOTIV) scale was developed to measure these motives and was administered to 530 students in university communication classes. Usable forms were returned by 504 students. Three criterion scales were administered with COMMOTIV to test its validity. Analysis of the scale indicated that it was stable over time and internally consistent. Tests to establish validity indicated that the scale primarily measured affective involvement, but, to a degree, also measures cognitive involvement. Although problems exist in the scale's measurement of concern for promoting other, COMMOTIV seemed to be valid as a measure of the tendency to approach others in communication. (The COMMOTIV scale and relevant tables of data are appended.) (SRT)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED279045

# COMMUNICATOR MOTIVATION:

# TOWARD CONCEPTUALIZATION AND MEASUREMENT

Terrence L. Chmielewski, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Communication and Theatre Arts
University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire

This research reports on an attempt to conceptualize and measure one of the components of communication competence: motivation. The construct of Communicator Motivation was defined as an affective tendency to approach and become involved in communication. Two specific motives were identified as reasons why an individual would approach communication: Concern for Promoting Self, and Concern for Promoting Other. The COMMOTIV scale was developed to measure these motives. Factor analysis and reliability analysis indicated that COMMOTIV was stable over time and internally consistent. Tests to establish the validity of the scale with respect to involvement indicated that COMMOTIV, while also measuring cognitive involvement, is primarily a measure of affective involvement. The guarded conclusion offered is that COMMOTIV is valid as a measure of the tendency to approach others in communication. Suggestions for further development of the concept of Communicator Motivation, and the COMMOTIV scale are offered.

A paper presented at the
Speech Communication Association convention;
Chicago, IL; November, 1986.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Terrence L. Chmielewski

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The research reported here was supported by a University Research and Creative Activity Grant, School of Graduate Studies, University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire.

CS 505 510



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

# COMMUNICATOR MOTIVATION: TOWARD CONCEPTUALIZATION AND MEASUREMENT

Recent research and theory in the area of communication competence has identified three aspects of competence. While terminologies differ, there is general agreement that competence is a combination of knowledge about communication, skill in performance, and the motivation to communicate (Wiemann & Backlund, 1980; Konsky & Murdock, 1980; Spitzberg, 1981, 1982; McCroskey, 1982b; Spitzberg & Cupach, 1984; Rubin, 1985). These same components have been used to describe competence in other realms of study, such as in social relations (Havighurst, 1957), organizational skills training (Clinard, 1979), and interpersonal performance (Ring, Braginsky, & Braginsky, 1966).

Knowledge refers to knowing how communication operates in the social world (McCroskey, 1982b). Mastery of this knowledge allows a person to generate a set of possible messages and determine their potential effects on the situation. Skill concerns a person's ability to enact messages smoothly and convincingly. Recent research on skills has focused on the ability to manage a communicative exchange. In fact, Wiemann (1977; Wiemann & Knapp, 1975) and others (Pearce, 1976; McLaughlin & Cody, 1982) have suggested that effective management is potentially the most important factor leading to impressions of competence. Motivation, the third component, is the drive a person experiences to communicate. Based in an affective tendency to approach or avoid people, it is a push toward or away

from interaction itself (Spitzberg & Cupach,1984). In sum, knowledge is knowing about communication, skill is knowing how to perform, and motivation is wanting to communicate.

While it is clear that these components are related to one another, it is important to note that "constructs reflecting motivation, knowledge, and skill are conceptually separable and often empirically unique" (Spitzberg & Cupach, 1984, p. 130). Each component is like a piece of a puzzle. While each gives a hint to, and is a part of, the complete picture, only when all of the pieces are assembled can we say what the picture really is. Only by examining each component and the links between them can we get a clear picture of the competency puzzle.

Yet, we are hampered in assembling our puzzle. One reason is that we have not scrutinized one piece of the puzzle well enough. Most of the work in communication competence has emphasized the knowledge and skill components, while less effort has been expended examining the nature of motivation and it's potential effects on behavior. With the notable exception of Communication Apprehension (e.g., McCroskey, 1977, 1982a, 1984), communicator motivation has received little attention in the field of Communication. What we know about the motivation to communicate is fragmented--probably the result of "borrowing" concepts from other fields and applying them to communication. As of yet, we don't have an integrated body of theory about communicator motives. Without an understanding of the nature of communicator motivation, our attempts at building better theories of communication competence will be incomplete.

This research has a dual focus. First, the construct of "communicator motivation" will be described toward the end of sketching some broad boundaries around it. Second, we will report an attempt to operationalize the construct. We feel that these initial efforts could serve as a basis for further specification of the concept and measurement of communicator motivation, and will eventually help to describe the links among the components.

## THE CONSTRUCT OF COMMUNICATOR MOTIVATION

A motive is a "state of tension within the individual which arouses, maintains and directs behavior toward a goal" (Chaplin, 1975, p. 326). In this way, communicator motivation is a person's desire to approach communication itself so that he/she may achieve goals which require the assistance of others. We view this motivation as an appreciation of communication as a tool with which interpersonal work can be accomplished. Communication is instrumental, and so it is valued.

To say that communication is perceived as instrumental implies some crucial questions about motivation: Instrumental for what purpose(s)? What 'work' must be done via communication? What are the goals which can be achieved through communication? In describing factors relevant for a motivational component of communication competence, Spitzberg and Cupach (1984) identify three attitudes which have been conceptually and empirically linked with the tendency to approach or avoid communication:

involvement, anxiety, and altercentrism. Involvement refers to the degree to which an individual perceives a communication situation as relevant for his/her self-concept and self-reward. The more the situation is relevant and rewarding to self, the greater the involvement in it. Anxiety produces an avoidance tendency. Due to a lack of success or experience with a particular communication situation, the anxious person avoids that which is potentially threatening--the communication situation itself. Finally, altercentrism is the tendency to be interested in, attentive to, and adaptive toward the conversational partner (Spitzberg & Cupach, 1984).

The first two of these attitudes, involvement and anxiety, suggest one general goal or purpose of communication: to promote the satisfaction of the self. To the extent that a person perceives the situation to be beneficial to self, he/she becomes involved; to the degree that he/she feels the situation will produce costs, he/she avoids. Thus, involvement and anxiety produce opposite approach-avoidance tendencies. The third attitude, altercentrism, implies another goal or purpose of communication, i.e., to promote satisfaction in the communication partner. Being other-directed implies a concern for the well-being of the communication partner, if only because showing concern is required for the partner's assistance. While both of these goals are instrumental for the communicator, they describe two different specific motivations a person can have when entering an exchange.

Research in a wide range of areas, contexts, and

perspectives are unified in suggesting two similar motives at the base of our communication behaviors. Based on a review and replication of research on the modes of interpersonal behavior, Bochner and Kaminski (1974) found remarkable consistency among studies indicating that there are two or three dimensions of interpersonal life. They state that, "labels for the factors frequently vary, but the two-factor structure usually indicates the presence or absence of affection between people and the domination and control of one person over others. When a third factor appears, it reflects some kind of activity rate, either social or task" (Bochner & Kaminski, 1974, p. 1079). In a later monograph on communication in relationship development, Bochner (1984) describes two themes of interpersonal communication, one having to do with influence and control (dominance-submission), and another having to do with affection (affection-hostility). Bochner feels these themes underlie all social interaction, stating that influence and affect may be thought of as variform universals--fundamental processes found in some form in all cultures (Triandis, 1978). Bochner (1984) further implies that affection and control are at the root of communication which leads to bonding.

We feel that control and affection are related to the two general communicator motives of concern for self and concern for other, respectively. Control reflects the desire to get others to comply so that the self is satisfied, while affection prompts a person to treat others with respect and consideration. While Bochner (1984; Bochner & Kaminski, 1974) is not concerned with

specifying affect and control as reasons or motives for engaging in exchange with others, his analysis at least implies that concern for self and other are major issues of interpersonal life that are handled through communication. Other researchers, however, have indicated that these two concerns are motives which underlay communication. While the labels used to describe the motives differ, they seem to reflect the same two reasons for engaging in communication. Representative examples of analyses utilizing similar notions includes Goffman's work in face-saving (Goffman, 1959, 1967, the analysis of compliance-gaining strategies (Rothbart, 1968; Michener & Schwertfeger, 1972; Kipnis, 1976; Sillars, 1979; Chmielewski, 1982), and various "grid" theories of leadership (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982; Blake and Mouton, 1985) and conflict style (Thomas & Kilmann, 1974; Thomas, 1975; Kilmann & Thomas, 1977; Phillips & Cheston, 1979).

Perhaps Wiemann's definition of communication competence best summarizes our thoughts on the motives for communication, and how these motives are relevant for competence. According to Wiemann (1977, p. 198), communicative competence is . . .

> the ability of an interactant to choose among available communicative behaviors in order that he may successfully accomplish his own interpersonal goals during an encounter while maintaining the face and line of his fellow interactants within the constraints of the situation. (emphasis added)

Wiemann seems to be making two important points. First, communication is motivated by the dual concerns of promoting self (through accomplishing goals) and promoting the communication partner (doing so in a way that does not challenge or harm the

partner).[1] Second, communication which reflects both concerns can be considered competent.

Based on our brief review of reasons why people communicate the way the do, we have posited two basic motives. We call them "Concern for Promoting Self", and "Concern for Promoting Other". In the following section we will attempt to explain what is meant by each of these constructs.

Each motive has two distinct yet inseparable aspects: an attitude of concern for people (i.e., concern for self, and concern for others), and an attitude about engaging in communication (i.e., concern for promoting self and other). Together these aspects direct and channel communication behavior so that it takes on a certain form and content. Three different attitudes or "values" are relevant for this analysis: self-esteem and empathy as general attitudes about people, and communication involvement as an attitude toward communicating.[2]

Concern for Promoting Self refers to an individual's desire to promote the interests and welfare of the self when communicating. It combines two global attitudes or values, a positive evaluation of the self (self-esteem) and a positive evaluation of the act and process of communicating. As suggested above, the term 'self-esteem' is used here to refer to the general attitude that the self is good, important, and deserves to be treated in that way by others. As a result, a person's mental set is securely focused on self, interpreting things that happen in terms of their relevance to self. In it's essence, esteem is a way of thinking and feeling about the self. Due to

it's evaluative nature, it arouses or triggers behavior; it "urges" behavior consistent with the individual's level of esteem. As a result, the individual might behave in certain characteristics ways.

The reader should note the emphasis on the word "might" in the preceeding sentence. Just because a person has a certain level of self-regard, it does not mean that he/she will act in any particular way. At most, he/she has a propensity toward acting. Having a concern for the welfare of the self is not enough for communicating competently; one must also be motivated to act out that concern in the presence of others. That is, one must also have the attitude that approaching others through communication is good. An individual can feel good about self, but if he/she does not feel good about communicating he/she cannot and will not approach others. Thus, besides valuing self, Concern for Promoting Self also includes valuing communication. Valuing the act and process of communicating can be called "communication involvement".

This notion of communication involvement is a relatively new addition to the lexicon of concepts relevant for communication competence. Involvement is the person's tendency to approach or avoid communication, representing the basic nature of the motivational component. Communication itself is valued because it is the medium through which feelings, information, and values can be made known to others. Thus, a person's needs can be satisfied and goals can be accomplished. In this way, communication involvement is an appreciation of communication as the tool for getting important interpersonal work done.

The involved speaker actively engages in interaction with an awareness of those aspects of the situation which influence the exchange. Being aware, he/she is sensitive to how communication affects people. Being aware and sensitive, the speaker is committed to communication. The characteristic features of communication involvement--those things which cause or indicate high regard for communication itself--are an awareness of, and sensitivity and commitment to communication as the vehicle for exchange. Concepts representative of this view of communication involvement would include Communication Apprehension (McCroskey, 1977, 1982a), Interaction Involvement (Cegala, 1978, 1981) and Rhetorical Sensitivity (Hart & Burks, 1972; Hart, Eadie, & Carlson, 1975; Hart, Carlson & Eadie, 1980). While all of these concepts are not affective in nature, as is our use of 'involvement', they all have been described as tendencies to approach or avoid communication. Additionally, all three seem to reflect the basic features of involvement: awareness, sensitivity, and commitment. Thus, Concern for Promoting Self is essentially an evaluation of self (i.e., self-esteem) which is activated into specific forms of behavior by an evaluation of communication (i.e., communication involvement).

Concern for Promoting Other refers to an individual's desire to promote the interests, welfare, and well-being of the communication partner. It combines high regard for the partner (empathy) with the attitude of communication involvement, as previously described. Empathy is conceived here as a generic attitude of positive evaluation of the partner, reflecting the

value that a partner deserves 'special treatment and consideration', if for no other reason than he/she is a human being. As a result, the individual wants good things to happen to the partner. The empathic person holds others in esteem, views them as inherently important, uses them as important points of reference, and wants to see their needs satisfied. As with self-esteem, empathy is considered to be a feeling of regard for others that has no necessary effect on communication behavior. Empathy is activated and channeled into communication through the attitude of communication involvement. Thus, Concern for Promoting Other is an evaluation of other (empathy) which is activated into specific forms of behavior by an evaluation of communication (involvement).

Thus, each of the individual motives, Concern for Promoting Self and Concern for Promoting Other, share the element of communication involvement in that the degree of involvement influences whether and how much empathy and esteem are displayed, and the form and content that display will take. How favorably communication is evaluated places parameters on behaviors reflective of empathy and self-esteem.

Given the above conceptualization, Communicator Motivation would serve at least three functions in communication. The first function of motivation is to give meaning to experience. The state of an individual's motives (i.e., what they are, and the amount of arousal they produce) act as perceptual screens, allowing only certain data to enter the person's field of awareness. The motives may also change the data into a form that

the person is ready to accept. In either case, information retrieved from the raw data is molded into a particular meaning. Thus, the motives determine the relevance of the situation for satisfying needs and accomplishing goals, thereby having implications for how a person might act.

The second and perhaps most important function of motivation is to set the person's goals for the situation, and to determine a plan of action. The situation has meaning for the individual that is in some way relevant to promoting self and/or other. As a result, a game plan is constructed which informs the person how to communicate in order to achieve his/her objectives. Empathy and self-esteem serve as selection criteria for the type or form of the communication behavior, while the particular levels of empathy and esteem determine the content of the message.

The third function of motivation is to activate the selected message into enactment. The tendency to approach or avoid communication will not only determine whether the message will actually be used, but the strength of that tendency will determine how smoothly and convincingly it would be delivered.

Thus, communicator motivation potentially has many and diverse effects on the quality, effectiveness, and overall adequacy of messages, as well as suggesting criteria on which a communicator might be judged as competent or incompetent. Because of the potential importance of the concept of Communicator Motivation for describing and explaining communication behavior, and for advancing our knowledge about

competency, the rest of this paper will report on the development of an instrument designed to measure a communicator's level and type of motivations.

## PREDICTIONS

Validity is the issue of whether a scale actually measures what it is supposed to measure; a scale is useful to the degree that it is valid. The validation of the Communicator Motivation scale (COMMOTIV) reported here was limited to the technique of concurrent validation. According to Sanders and Pinhey (1983, p. 91) concurrent validity is the "ability of an item [or scale] to produce results that are in keeping with those from some criterion that is observed at the same time the item [or scale] is administered." The reasoning behind concurrent validation is that the operationalized concept (COMMOTIV) is a valid measure of the theoretical construct (Communicator Motivation) if it produces a predictable pattern of relations with other criterion measures taken at the same time. This section describes the predicted patterns of relations among COMMOTIV and three other scales. If results support the predictions, there is evidence for the validity of COMMOTIV.

Our emphasis here is on one aspect of Motivation, the tendency to approach or avoid interaction. In our opinion, this tendency is the most important aspect of Communicator Motivation, and that which makes it suitable for contributing to the study of communication competence. Thus, our primary interest is with

establishing the validity of COMMOTIV with respect to the approach-avoidance tendency. This tendency is most directly reflected in the attitude of communication involvement. As a result, predictions will focus on the relations between involvement and three validating concepts. The particular criterion concepts were chosen because of their theoretical relevance to Communication Motivation and their established empirical links with competent communication.

Interaction Involvment

Cegala (1978, 1981) created the concept of Interaction Involvement, which refers to the degree that an individual is "plugged-into" communication. It reflects attentiveness, perceptiveness, and responsiveness; it is a consciousness of self, other, and situation which indicate the "extent to which an individual partakes in a social environment" (Cegala, 1981, p. 112). Thus, Interaction Involvement directs attention toward communication. Interaction Involvment should thus be positively related to Communicator Motivation. Additionally, Interaction Involvement is a consciousness of both self and other, and so should be directly related to each of the specific motivations, Concern for Promoting Self and Concern for Promoting Other. Thus, we would hypothesize:

$H_{1a}$: There will be a significant positive correlation between Interaction Involvement and Communicator Motivation.

$H_{1b}$: There will be a significant positive correlation between Interaction Involvement and Concern for Promoting Self.

$H_{1c}$: There will be a significant positive correlation between Interaction Involvement and Concern for Promoting Other.

Communication Apprehension

Communication Apprehension is a "broadly-based anxiety relating to oral communication" which results from expectancy learning and responsiveness learning (McCroskey, 1982a, 1984). A person comes to fear communication when he/she predicts failure because of past experiences. When in a novel situation, when there is no basis for the prediction, fear is also produced. Fearing negative consequences, the individual will avoid the situation which generates those consequences--communication itself. Thus, because Communication Apprehension is an avoidance tendency, it should be inversely related to Communicator Motivation. Since fear and anxiety reference the self, we would also expect an inverse relationship between Apprehension and Concern for Promoting Self.

$H_{2a}$: There will be a significant negative correlation between Communication Apprehension and Communicator Motivation.

$H_{2b}$: There will be a significant negative correlation between Communication Apprehension and Concern for Promoting Self.

Self-Monitoring

Self-monitoring is a person's tendency to observe and control self-presentation and expressive behaviors. This tendency originates in the desire to be seen as acting appropriately in a situation (Snyder, 1974, 1979). High self-monitors attend to cues in the situation, especially those given

off by the communication partner. Attention to these cues provides the high self-monitor with information on how to present self to others in order to be seen in the most desirable way. The presentation of the low self-monitor, on the other hand, is guided by his/her own internal states. Expressive behavior is "controlled from within by their affective states (they express it as they feel it) rather than being monitored, controlled, and molded to fit the situation" (Snyder, 1974, p. 527).

At the tendency to self-monitor increases, an individual would be more attentive and vigilant in the search for cues for appropriate behavior (Spitzberg & Cupach, 1984). As the tendency to self-monitor decreases, there would be less attention to others and more attention to self as the individual surveys his/her own internal states. Since attentiveness to self, other, and situation suggests involvement, as self-monitoring increases, so should involvement. This implies that Self-monitoring is directly related to Concern for Promoting Self, while being inversely related to Concern for Promoting Other. These opposite predictions would seem to have two effects. First, there should be no stable relationship between Self-monitoring and Communicator Motivation. Second, opposite predictions may tend to depress the magnitude of the correlations between Self-monitoring and the two specific motives. Nevertheless, we would hypothesize as follows:

$H_{3a}$: There will be a significant positive correlation between Self-monitoring and Concern for Promoting Self.

$H_{3b}$: There will be a significant negative correlation

between Self-monitoring and Concern for Promoting Other.

Having hypothesized about the relationships between Comunicator Motivation and the three criterion concepts, the following section discusses the methods and procedures used when testing for validity. First, the construction of the Communicator Motivation scale (COMMOTIV) is described. Second, the procedures used when administering the scale are reported. Third, the results of item analysis and reliability assessment are detailed. Finally, the statistical procedures used to assess the validity of COMMOTIV are introduced.

## METHODS AND PROCEDURES

### Scale Construction

COMMOTIV was comprised of items designed to tap it's two specific motives, Concern for Promoting Self (CPS), and Concern for Promoting Other (CPO). Items were written for each subscale in the following manner. First, a variety of Interpersonal Communication texts and specific monographs on social/communication competence were examined to derive indicators of the motives. This was done to identify specific attitudes/motives that might be relevant to CPS and CPO. Indicators of CPO include a willingness to help satisfy the other's needs, to give positive regard, to save other's face, to give the other consideration and esteem, and to allow the other freedom to behave. Indicators of CPS include a desire to have own needs satisfied, to persuade, to

freedom to behave. Indicators of CPS include a desire to have own needs satisfied, to persuade, to save face, to voice an opinion, and to disagree in the face of an opposing view.

Second, a list of general communication situations in which these motives could operate was generated. Examples of these situations include an argument, a conversation, a discussion, and asking of assistance. There was an attempt to sample as many different commonly-experienced situations as possible. Third, items were written containing two parts or clauses. One clause identified or implied a communciation situation in which CPO or CPS might operate. A second clause contained a statement about how the respondent might feel or behave in the situation. Items were written to be used with a five step Likert-type response format of "I STRONGLY AGREE with the statement" (coded 0), to "I STRONGLY DISAGREE with the statement" (coded 4).

Approximately 80 items were written for each subscale. After elimination of some of them for replication, poor wording, ambiguity, or the improbability of the situation ever having happened to the respondent, 50 items remained on each subscale. The 100 items were then arranged with the CPS items given the even numbers, and the CPO, the odd.[3]

Procedures

The three criterion scales were administered with COMMOTIV to test it's validity. They were Snyder's Self-Monitoring scale (S-M; 1974), Cegala's Interaction Involvement Scale (IIS; 1981), and McCroskey's Personal Report of Communication Apprehension-24

(PRCA24; 1982c). Three other scales were also administered for a different research purpose.[4]

To reduce the time for completing the scales and avoid subject fatigue due to the large number of items, not all subjects completed all of the scales. Instead, seven different forms were used. One form contained demographic items and COMMOTIV, and another, all seven scales. The remaining five forms contained some of the six validity scales. The shortest one contained 115 items, the longest, 282, and the five of moderate length, an average of 186 items.

The forms were distributed to lower-division Communication classes at a midwestern and an eastern university during class times. The author's own upper division classes at the former institution were also used. Forms were distributed during the first week of the Fall, 1984, and Spring, 1985 terms. Most of the respondents participated voluntarily, with the exception of the author's own classes, who were required to participate to complete a research component for the course. These students also completed COMMOTIV again after a period of one month to check test-retest reliability. Approximately 530 forms were distributed, with 504 of them returned with COMMOTIV in usable condition.

## Reliability Analysis

Data were reduced and factor structure was examined by factor analysis. The computer operating system available to the author could not accommodate enough core space for analyzing all

100 COMMOTIV items simultaneously. Thus, three separate runs were made, with 67 items in each run. Each item was factored with every other item twice. The same factoring parameters were used for each run, with the number of factors extracted set at two. An item was eliminated from further consideration if it appeared in the bottom eight loadings for each of the two runs on which it appeared. This resulted in the elimination of 17 items.[5]

The remaining 83 items were entered into a principal components factor analysis. SPSS defaults were in effect except that the number of factors was constrained to two. The first factor accounted for 14.7% of the variance, with with the second factor adding another 7.5%. A third factor would have added 4.5%.

Two criteria were used when selecting items for further analysis: at least a .40 loading on the primary factor, and a separation of at least .20 from the secondary loading. This resulted in the elimination of all but 39 items.

FAC 1 contained 25 items, all but one of which were originally determined to be CPS items. Fourteen of the items had positive loadings, reflecting communication situations in which the respondent did not act in ways promoting the self (e.g., "I'm usually reluctant to voice my opinion in a discussion group", "When I'm in a small discussion group, I'd rather keep quiet than say something that others might think is stupid"). The remaining items had negative loadings, reflecting situations where the respondent promoted self (e.g., "I'm very comfortable contributing my own ideas to a group discussion", "If something

needs to be said, I'm usually the one to say it"). Thus, FAC 1 was defined as concern for Promoting Self.

FAC 2 contained fourteen items, with thirteen of them originally defined as belonging to CPO. All of the FAC 2 items carried positive loadings, reflecting situations in which the respondent acted or felt in ways which "put-down" the other (e.g., "When someone is bragging, I get a kick out of putting him/her down"), or showed little concern for the partner's well-being (e.g., "One of my personal philosophies is, "if you can't make a person think as you do, make him/her do as you think"). Thus, FAC 2 reflects a lack of concern, and sometimes a negative concern, for the well-being of the partner. This was interpreted as the polar opposite of promoting the partner. Thus, FAC 2 was interpreted as concern for Promoting Other.

The resulting 39-item COMMOTIV scale was then entered into a series of Cronbach's $\alpha$ procedures to examine it's internal consistency. Items were eliminated from CPO and CPS (not COMMOTIV) until the highest $\alpha$ was achieved. As a result, only one item was eliminated. The 38-item scale achieved an $\alpha$ of .877, with CPO, $\alpha$ = .783 (14 items), and CPS, $\alpha$ = .905 (24 items).

Test-retest correlations were also run to assess the stability of COMMOTIV over one month. COMMOTIV achieved a test-retest correlation of .723 ($p < .001$), while the coefficients for CPS and CPO were .718 ($p < .001$) and .766 ($p < .001$), respectively.[6]

A final principal components analysis was run on the 38-item instrument, with the number of factors constrained to two. The first factor had an eigenvalue of 8.18, accounting for 21.5% of the variance. This factor contained the 24 CPS items. The second factor had an eigenvalue of 3.86, accounting for an additional 10.2% of variance. It was comprised of the 14 CPO items. The items, their loadings, and their item-total correlations can be found in Table 1.

---

Insert Table 1 here

---

Statistical Analysis

As a result of this series of analyses, it was concluded that COMMOTIV was sufficiently reliable to justify an examination of it's validity. A series of zero-order Pearson correlation tests were used for this purpose. An alpha level of .05 (one-tailed) was establish as the criterion for acceptance. The results of the validity tests are reported in the next section.

Responses to the validity scales were coded and calculated according to the authors' published specifications.[7] Responses to COMMOTIV were coded and summed so that high scores indicated high Communicator Motivation, Concern for Promoting Self, and Concern for Promoting Other. Table 2 displays the means, sds, and $\alpha$ co-efficeints for all scales. They were generally comparable to the same statistics for each of the validity scales, as reported elsewhere. The exception to this was the reliability coefficient for Self-Monitoring ( $\alpha$ = .653), which was lower than previously reported.

---

Insert Table 2 here

---

Scale scores were then standardized. For S-M, the items were merely summed and standardized. For the IIS and the PRCA24 items for each subscale were summed individually, reduced to unit weight, and these average scores were then standardized. The standardized subscale scores were then added and standardized to yield the total scale scores. These standardized scale and subscale scores were then used for all statistical analyses.

## RESULTS

COMMOTIV scores were inserted into a series of Pearson correlation procedures individually with each validity scale to test the hypotheses. Table 3 displays the matrix of correlation coefficients.

---

Insert Table 3 here

---

The first set of hypotheses concerned the relationship between Motivation and Interaction Involvement (Cegala, 1981). All three hypotheses predicted a direct relationship. Results supported all of the hypotheses. The IIS was significantly related to COMMOTIV ($\underline{r}$ = .33, n = 152, $p < .001$), CPS ($\underline{r}$ = .32, $p < .001$), and CPO ($\underline{r}$ = .21, $p < .005$) in the expected direction.

While not hypothesized the relationships between COMMOTIV

and the IIS subscales were generally as would be expected. COMMOTIV was significantly correlated with Attentiveness (ATT: $r$ = .29, $p < .001$), Perceptiveness (PERC: $r$ = .20, $p < .006$), and Responsiveness (RESP: $r$ = .34, $p < .001$). CPS was also related to the subscales in the same way (ATT: $r$ = .23, $p < .002$; PERC: $r$ = .23, $p < .002$; RESP: $r$ = .34, $p < .001$). Finally, CPO was directly related to ATT ($r$ =.21, $p < .005$) and PERC ($r$ = .21, $p < .005$) and RESP ($r$ = .18, $p$ = .012). The only correlation that did not fit the pattern suggested by our conceptualization of CPO was the coefficient between CPO and PERC ($r$ = .11, $p$ = .094, ns). As PERC is a measure of a person's "tendency to understand what meanings to assign to others' behavior" (Cegala, 1981, p. 115), we would have expected a stronger relationship with CPO as a measure of concern for the other person. If one is concerned with the welfare of others, one should be able to understand their meanings--or at least, to make an attempt at understanding. We would also expect that PERC be more strongly related to CPO than to CPS, but the reverse was found. Even considering these results, however, the majority of evidence suggests the first three hypotheses were strongly supported by the data.

The second set of hypotheses suggested an inverse relationship between Communicator Motivation and Communication Apprehension. Hypothesis 2a posited a negative correlation between COMMOTIV and the PRCA24, and results were as expected ($r$ = -.46, $n$ = 151, $p < .001$). Hypothesis 2b predicted the same relationship between CPS and PRCA24. Again, the data supported the prediction ($r$ = - .76, $p < .001$). While not hypothesized,

the relations among the PRCA24 subscales and COMMOTIV were what might be expected. All coefficients were negative, suggesting that COMMOTIV, a measure of approach, is inversely related to the PRCA24, a measure of avoidance. Additionally, one would expect no large relationship between Apprehension, a self-based fear, and CPO, and other-based approach tendency. Such was the case, as there was no substantial relationship between PRCA24 and CPO ($r$ = -.09, p = .141, ns). Thus, the hypothesized relationship between Communicator Motivation and Communication Apprehension was supported by the data.

The third set of hypotheses concerned the relationship between Self-monitoring and the specific motives. Hypothesis 3a predicted a positive correlation between S-M and CPS. While the correlation was in the indicated direction, it fell short of significance ($r$ = .12, n = 135, p = .08, ns). The next hypothesis predicted an inverse relationship between S-M and CPO. Results supported the prediction ($r$ = - .15, $p < .04$). S-M was not related to COMMOTIV in a consistent way ($r$ = - .07, p = .22, ns), probably because of the opposite relations between S-M, and CPS and CPO.

While the directions of the correlations were as expected, their magnitudes were rather small (even though Hypothesis 3b was supported). There are numerous possible reasons for the small coefficients. First, the S-M scale was not highly reliable in this study, achieving an $\alpha$ of only .653. Scores on S-M may not have been stable. Second, the validity of S-M has been questioned (Briggs, Cheek, & Buss, 1980; Gabrenya & Arkin, 1980),

especially in the area of it's unidimensionality. If S-M is not a valid measure of Self-monitoring, one would not expect a certain association with any other variable. Third, predicting a two-dimensional variable (Communicator Motivation) from one that is unidimensional (Self-monitoring) may have depressed the magnitude of the association as opposite "sides" of the Self-monitoring continuum is split in two, with each half predicting a different motive. Finally, it may be that our conceptual analysis of Communicator Motivation and/or Self-monitoring was too imprecise, or the analysis of the association between the two concepts was in error. However, given that the correlations were in the predicted direction, this last reason seems improbable. Thus, one or more of the first three reasons probably caused the small coefficients.

## DISCUSSION

The notion of communicator motivation has received little attention in the literature on communication competence, and yet it has a potentially powerful effect upon a person's communication and competency. As a result, we attempted to conceptualize "Communicator Motivation" as an affectively-based tendency to approach communication. Important aspects of Motivation include a sensitivity to and appreciation of communication as a tool for accomplishing work, an awareness of how communication accomplishes this work, and a commitment to a process of exchange. These aspects, when combined, represent

communication involvement. The motivated communicator seeks to involve him/herself in an exchange, and acts as if he/she is involved.

Involvement is an activating mechanism for two atittudes which are relevant for communication and competence: self-esteem, and empathy. These attitudes reflect a positive evaluation of self and other, respectively. Combining each of these attitudes with involvement yields two distinct motives for communicating: Concern for Promoting Self, and Concern for Promoting Other. They represent the underlying reasons why people communicate the way they do--to promote the welfare of the self, and to promote the welfare of the communication partner in the exchange.

Thus, we constructed an instrument to measure these motives. The resulting COMMOTIV scale contained 38 items. Factor analysis showed that the first dimension which emerged could clearly be interpreted as Concern for Promoting Self. The interpretation of the second factor, however, was not as clear. Thirteen of the 14 items were originally written to tap Concern for Promoting Other. However, the wording of the items suggested that the factor reflected a contempt for the partner, a willingness to 'put him/her down', and a lack of concern for his/her welfare. At the time it seemed reasonable to consider the factor as reflecting the polar opposite of concern for the other. Thus, coding was reflected, and we felt we could interpret the factor as Concern for Promoting Other with a certain degree of confidence. That conclusion seems somewhat suspect at this point.

Reliability analysis was conducted on the scale. COMMOTIV and CPS were both homogeneous and stable through time. While CPO seemed stable, it was rather low when considering internal consistency. While the alpha coefficient was considered acceptable at .78, it could have been higher. Nevertheless, we were confident in the conclusion that COMMOTIV was reliable.

In order to determine whether COMMOTIV is a useful scale, we attempted to establish it's validity as a measure of involvement, it's characteristic feature. Results of the tests for validity were generally positive and encouraging. The associations between Communicator Motivation and Interaction Invovement were relatively strong. Relationships between Motivation and the individual aspects of Involvement were also as expected, indicating that COMMOTIV measures a mental set that prompts and individual to become involved in communication. The relationship between Motivation and Communication Apprehension was even stronger, with correlations in the .36 to .77 range. Closer examination of the aspects of Communication Apprehension indicates that COMMOTIV is most highly related to fear of speaking in the small group context. The association between Motivation and Self-monitoring also indicates that COMMOTIV measures cognitive involvement in the context of self-presentation and expressiveness. While this association was weak, it was in the proper direction.

Taken as a whole the results suggest that COMMOTIV is a useful and valid indicator of the tendency to become involved in communication. In addition, the strong association with

Communication Apprehension, an affective avoidance tendency, and weaker associations with Interaction Involvement and Self-Monitoring, both cognitive approach tendencies, suggests that COMMOTIV measures affective approach-avoidance. While COMMOTIV seems to measure both affective and cognitive involvement, it is a much stronger measure of affective involvement. While one study cannot validate an instrument, we offer the guarded conclusion that COMMOTIV is valid with respect to an affectively-based tendency to approach communication.

While the results of this research are promising, much more needs to be done to clarify the concept of Communicator Motivation, and to continue the validation process on COMMOTIV. We feel that successive replications of a study like the one reported here, each time examining a specific issue or idea, will eventually lead to advances in the field of communication competence. Further research along these lines is currently being planned.

1. The conceptual and operational definitions of Communicator Motivation must be clarified, setting specific boundaries around the concept.

2. The reliability of the scale should be increased. While CPS seems to be stable and homogeneous, CPO must be made more reliable.

3. COMMOTIV seems to be measuring things other than Concern for Promoting Self and concern for Promoting Other, as indicated by the relatively low amount of variance accounted for by the items. In other words, COMMOTIV is "dirtier" than we

would want. Rewriting ambiguous items, adding more items, and other steps should be taken to increase the scale's coherence.

4. Further work must be done to make CPO a purer measure of Concern for Promoting Other. Specifically, we question whether the opposite of 'concern' for other is 'contempt' for other, as the items of CPO seem to indicate.

5. The validity of COMMOTIV as a measure of empathy and self-esteem needs to be addressed.

6. The predictive validity of the scale must be established.

NOTES

1. We are taking Wiemann's words at face value, and do not assume a dramaturgical framework. While dramaturgy provides a rich and useful vocabulary for describing how a communicator might act, we are more interested in motives based in personal values of esteem and empathy. Our view of motivation is not based in Goffman's work on self-presentation and face-saving.

2. We use the terms "self-esteem," "empathy", and "communication involvement" only in their general sense of having a positive evaluation of self, other, and communication.

3. The 100 item COMMOTIV scale is available from the author, along with all the results of statistical tests not reported here.

4. The other scales used were Norton's (1983) Communicator Stlye-Open and -Attentive scales, and Ring and Wallston's (1968) Performance Style Test. These were included to examine the relationship between Communicator Motivation and involvement, as indicated in behavioral styles. Results can be found in Chmielewski (1985).

5. To check whether the factor analyses eliminated items prematurely, the 17 items were correlated with COMMOTIV. Results showed that 11 of the items correlated with CPO or CPS at the $r = .15$ level ($p < .001$). These items were entered into a factor analysis with the 38 COMMOTIV items. Results showed that the items <u>decreased</u> the variance accounted for by 5.8%. The loadings for these items were low, with none exceeding .29 on their primary factor.

6. Reliabilities for Time 2 were comparable to those at Time 1. At Time 2, the $\alpha$ reliabilities were .862 for COMMOTIV ($n = 170$), .831 for CPS, and .784 for CPO. The respective coefficients for Time 1 were .844, .878, and .779.

7. In some cases, the authors' directions were adapted, and the response format was modified to allow the use of optical scan coding.

REFERENCE LIST

Blake, R.F., & Mouton, J.S. (1985). The managerial grid. Houston, TX: Gulf.

Bochner, A.P. (1984). The functions of human communication in interpersonal bonding. In C.C. Arnold & J.W. Bowers (Eds.), Handbook of rhetorical and communication theory (pp. 544-621). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Bochner, A.P., & Kaminski, E.P. (1974). Modes of interpersonal behavior: A replication. Psychological Reports, 35, 1079-1083.

Briggs, S.R., Cheek, J.M., & Buss, A. H. (1980). An analysis of the self-monitoring scale. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38, 679-686.

Cegala, D.J. (1978). Interaction involvement: A fundamental dimension of interpersonal communication. Paper presented at the meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Minneapolis, MN.

Cegala, D.J. (1981). Interaction involvement: A cognitive dimension of communication involvement. Communication Education, 30, 109-121.

Chaplin, J.P. (1975). Dictionary of Psychology. New York: Dell.

Chmielewski, T.L. (1985). Motivation for Competent Communication: Conceptualization and Measurement. Unpublished manuscript, University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire.

Chmielewski, T.L. (1982). A test of a model for predicting strategy choice. Central States Speech Journal, 33, 505-518.

Clinard, H. (1979). Interpersonal communication skills training. Training and Development, 33, 34-38.

Filley, A.C. (1975). Interpersonal conflict resolution. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.

Gabrenya, W.K., Jr., & Arkin, R.M. (1980). Self-monitoring scale Factor structure and correlates. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 6, 13-22.

Goffman, E. (1967). Interaction ritual. Chicago· Aldine.

Goffman, E. (1959). The presentation of self in everyday life. Garden City, NJ: Doubleday.

Hart, R.P., & Burks, D.M. (1972). Rhetorical sensitivity and social interaction. Speech Monographs, 39, 75-91.

Hart, R.P., Carlson, R.E., & Eadie, W.F. (1980). Attitudes toward communication and the assessment of rhetorical sensitivity. Communication Monographs, 47, 1-22.

Hart, R.P., Eadie, W.F., & Carlson, R.E. (1975). Rhetorical Sensitivity and Communication Competence. Paper presented at the meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Houston, TX.

Havighurst, R.J. (1957). The social competence of middle-aged people. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 56, 279-375.

Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. Management of organizational behavior. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall,

Kilmann, R.H. & Thomas, K.W. (1977). Developing a forced-choice measure of conflict-handling behavior: The "MODE" instrument. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 37, 309-325.

Kipnis, D. (1976). The powerholders. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Konsky, C.W., & Murdock, J.I. (1980). Interpersonal communication. In C.W. Cragan & D.W. Wright (Eds.), Introduction to speech communication (pp. 83-113). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

McCroskey, J.C. (1977). Oral communication apprehension: A summary of recent theory and research. Human Communication Theory, 4, 78-96.

McCroskey, J.C. (1982a). Oral communication apprehension: A reconceptualization. In M. Burgoon (Ed.), Communication Yearbook 6 (pp. 136-170). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

McCroskey, J.C. (1982b). Communication competence and performance: A research and pedagogical perspective. Communication Education, 31, 1-7.

McCroskey, J.C. (1982c). An introduction to rhetorical communication. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

McCroskey, J.C. (1984). The communication apprehension perspective. In J.A. Daly & J.C. McCroskey (Eds.), Avoiding communication: Shyness, reticence, and communication apprehension (pp. 13-38). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

McLaughlin, M.L., & Cody, M.J. (1982). Awkward silences: Behavioral antecedents and consequences of the conversational lapse. Human Communication Research, 8, 299-316.

Michener, H.A., & Schwertfeger, M. (1972). Liking as a determinant of power tactic preference. Sociometry, 35, 190-202.

Norton, R. (1983). Communicator style. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Pearce, W.B. (1976). An overview of communication and interpersonal relationships. In R.L. Applbaum & R.P. Hart (Eds.), MODCOM: Modules in speech communication (entire issue). Chicago: Science Research Associates.

Phillips, E., & Cheston, R. (1979). Conflict resolution: What works? California Management Review, 21, pp. 76-83.

Rahim, M.A. (1983). A measure of styles of handling interpersonal conflict. Academy of Management Journal, 26, 368-376.

Ring, K., Braginsky, D., & Braginsky, B. (1966). Performance styles in interpersonal relations: A typology. Psychological Reports, 18, 203-220.

Ring, K., & Wallston, K. (1968). A test to measure performance styles in interpersonal relations. Psychological Reports, 22, 147-154.

Rothbart, M. (1968). Effects of motivation, equity, and compliance on the use of reward and punishment. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 9, 353-362.

Rubin, R.B. (1985). The validity of the Communication Competency Assessment Instrument. Communication Monographs, 52, 173-185.

Sanders, W.B., & Pinhey, T.K. (1983). The conduct of social research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Sillars, A.L. (1979). The Stranger and Spouse as Target Persons for Compliance-gaining Strategies: Expected Utility of Appeals and Speaker Adaptation. Paper presented at the meeting of the International Communication Association, Philadelphia, PA.

Snyder, M. (1974). Self-monitoring of expressive behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 30, 526-537.

Snyder, M. (1979). Cognitive, behavioral, and interpersonal consequences of self-monitoring. In P. Pliner, K.R. Blakenstein, & I.M. Spigel (Eds.), Advances in the study of communication and affect (pp. 181-201). New York: Academic Press.

Spitzberg, B.H. (1981). Competence in Communicating: A Taxonomy, Review, Critique, and Predictive Model. Paper presented at the meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Anaheim, CA.

Spitzberg, B. H. (1982). Other-orientation and Relational Competence. Paper presented at the meeting of the Western Speech Communication Association, Denver, CO.

Spitzberg, B.H., & Cupach, W.R. (1984). Interpersonal communication competence. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Thomas, K.W. (1976). Conflict and conflict management. In M. Dunnette (Ed.), Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology (pp. 889-935). Chicago: Rand-McNally.

Thomas, K.W., & Kilmann, R.H. (1974). The Thomas-Kilmann conflict MODE instrument. Tuxedo Park, NY: Xicom.

Triandis, H.C. (1978). Interpersonal behavior. Monterey, CA: Brooks-Cole.

Wiemann, J.M. (1977). Explication and test of a model of communication competence. Human Communication Research, 3, 195-213.

Wiemann, J.M., & Backlund, P. (1980). Current theory and research in communicative competence. Review of Educational Research, 50, 185-199.

Wiemann, J.M., & Knapp, M.L. (1975). Turn-taking in conversation. Journal of Communication, 25, 75-92.

Table 1. The Final COMMOTIV Scale.

| Subscale / Item | | Loadings | | Item-total Corrs | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | FAC1(CPS) | FAC2(CPO) | w/SUB | w/SCALE |
| CPS | | | | | |
| 50 | I'm usually reluctant to voice my opinion in a discussion group. | 787 | 049 | 743 | 664 |
| 96 | When I'm in a small discussion group, I'd rather keep quiet than say something that others might think is stupid. | 700 | 129 | 663 | 622 |
| 52 | I'm very comfortable contributing my own ideas to a group discussion. | -698 | 056 | 646 | 540 |
| 94 | If something needs to be said, I would prefer not to say it myself. | 668 | 111 | 628 | 593 |
| 46 | I would rather not rock-the-boat in a discussion than to take an unpopular stand on an issue. | 665 | 165 | 614 | 597 |
| 72 | I enjoy contributing ideas to small group discussions. | -640 | 014 | 584 | 510 |
| 12 | I doubt that I could contribute enough good ideas to really make a difference in a group discussion. | 639 | 035 | 578 | 518 |
| 32 | If something needs to be said, I'm usually the one to say it. | -593 | 158 | 520 | 396 |
| 22 | When I'm in a small group discussion, I'd rather keep quiet than say something that others would think is irrelevant. | 589 | 098 | 543 | 506 |
| 10 | When I'm in a small group discussion, I would rather not take the chance of saying something that the majority of the other members would disagree with. | 578 | 192 | 533 | 536 |
| 98 | I would rather give-in than take a stand on an issue that most others disagree with. | 573 | 207 | 528 | 424 |
| 70 | When I have a disagreement with a boss, supervisor, or teacher, I usually speak up for my side of the issue. | -562 | 121 | 511 | 397 |
| 69 | When I'm working with a group of people on a problem-solving task, I'm the one who makes sure everyone understands the possible solutions. | -561 | 121 | 511 | 411 |
| 90 | I would be nervous to start a discussion or give my opinion on a topic that I know well. | 553 | 072 | 508 | 471 |

Table 1 - Continued.

| Subscale / Item | | Loadings | | Item-total Corrs | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | FAC1(CPS) | FAC2(CPO) | w/SUB | w/SCALE |
| CPS - Continued | | | | | |
| 16 | If I disagree with my boss or superior, I usually accept his/her point of view without giving my own. | 510 | 067 | 460 | 432 |
| 44 | Even though I can concede a point in a discussion, I will usually press my ideas until others at least understand it. | -506 | 232 | 433 | 300 |
| 34 | When I have a disagreement with my superiors I usually accept their point without questioning it. | 494 | 027 | 455 | 405 |
| 56 | It's often better for me to present my side of the case and take the consequences than to agree with others just to smooth-over a possible disagreement. | -493 | -091 | 433 | 415 |
| 100 | The best way for me to handle a confrontation is to keep my mouth shut. | 484 | 130 | 430 | 424 |
| 43 | When I'm working in a small group, I make sure everyone understands what we accomplished in the session. | -443 | 095 | 383 | 320 |
| 62 | I would not feel guilty if I agreed with someone just to smooth-over an argument. | 433 | 151 | 392 | 396 |
| 42 | I like it when other people come to me to ask for my input in a discussion. | -410 | 115 | 346 | 269 |
| 60 | I'd rather not tell someone when he/she has said something that hurt my feelings. | 400 | 059 | 368 | 343 |
| 68 | In a discussion it's my right to tell others my ideas on the topic. | -364 | -024 | 307 | 280 |
| CPO | | | | | |
| 27 | One of my personal philosophies is, "if you can't make a person think as you do, make him/her do as you think." | -042 | 598 | 470 | 200 |
| 11 | When someone is bragging, I get a kick out of putting him/her down. | -023 | 566 | 455 | 536 |
| 93 | When I'm sure I'm right, I try to press my point till I've persuaded the other person to my way of thinking. | -155 | 564 | 438 | 098 |
| 55 | When I'm sure I'm right, I usually press my point until I win the argument. | -212 | 559 | 418 | 048 |

Table 1 - Continued.

| Subscale Item | | Loadings | | Item-total Corrs | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | FAC1(CPS) | FAC2(CPO) | w/SUB | w/SCALE |
| CPO - Continued | | | | | |
| 33 | When a person is acting smug, I enjoy it when someone puts that person down. | 039 | 557 | 468 | 258 |
| 29 | When someone is trying to be the center of attention, I secretly enjoy it when someone puts him/her in his/her place. | 067 | 531 | 433 | 269 |
| 17 | I have little use for people who disagree with me. | 115 | 528 | 436 | 293 |
| 26 | I enjoy it very much when I've persuaded someone to my point-of-view. | -152 | 505 | 375 | 078 |
| 89 | I would like to be the kind of leader who can pressure others to follow me. | 024 | 494 | 369 | 203 |
| 37 | I get upset when the person I'm talking with disagrees with me. | 279 | 480 | 395 | 405 |
| 15 | When a person is about to embarrass him-/herself, I like to sit back and watch what's happening. | 043 | 473 | 363 | 214 |
| 77 | It's more important that I agree with a person than it is to know why he/she feels the way he/she does. | 291 | 435 | 349 | 402 |
| 65 | I try my best to avoid people whom I know disagree with my views. | 316 | 404 | 317 | 401 |
| 19 | Once I make up my mind on an issue I don't like other people telling me their differing views on it. | 096 | 382 | 287 | 210 |

Table 2.

Summary of Scale Statistics.

| Scale /Subscales | Number of Items | Scale Mean | sd | N | Coefficient Alpha |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| COMMOTIV | 38 | 94.04 | 15.50 | 491 | .877 |
| /CPS | 24 | 61.04 | 13.00 | 493 | .905 |
| /CPO | 14 | 32.99 | 6.79 | 498 | .783 |
| SELF-MONITORING | 25 | 13.12 | 3.81 | 138 | .653 |
| INTERACTION INVOLV | 18 | 45.35 | 12.92 | 159 | .919 |
| /RESP | 7 | 17.51 | 5.88 | 159 | .874 |
| /PERC | 7 | 18.70 | 5.81 | 159 | .893 |
| /ATT | 4 | 9.13 | 3.61 | 159 | .785 |
| PRCA24 | 24 | 64.61 | 17.05 | 155 | .954 |
| /DISC | 6 | 15.15 | 5.54 | 155 | .921 |
| /MEET | 6 | 16.13 | 5.20 | 155 | .923 |
| /CONV | 6 | 14.39 | 4.23 | 155 | .876 |
| /SPEK | 6 | 18.94 | 5.09 | 155 | .887 |

Note: For all scales and subscales responses were coded so that "high" scores had a high amount of the target concept. For example, high scores on Interaction Involvement means high involvement, and high scores on Communication Apprehension means high fear of speaking. In all cases, this was in keeping with the scoring procedures suggested by the scales authors. Directions for each of the criterion scales were adapted for use in this study when necessary. The criterion scales are available for inspection from the author.

Table 3.

Matrix of Intercorrelations Among COMMOTIV and All Validity Scales.

| | COMMOTIV | | | IIS | | | | S-M | PRCA24 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | TOTAL | CPS | CPO | TOTAL | RESP | PERC | ATT | | TOTAL | DISC | MEET | CONV | SPEK |
| SPEK | -3600<br>151 000 | -5597<br>151 000 | -0961<br>151 120 | 0462<br>103 321 | 0112<br>103 455 | 1143<br>103 124 | 0099<br>103 464 | -0379<br>90 361 | 8023<br>151 000 | 6395<br>151 000 | 6006<br>151 000 | 4597<br>151 000 | 897 |
| CONV | -3534<br>151 000 | -5494<br>151 000 | -0934<br>151 127 | -0909<br>103 180 | -2401<br>103 075 | -0629<br>103 264 | 0115<br>103 454 | -0806<br>90 225 | 7792<br>151 000 | 6039<br>151 000 | 6537<br>151 000 | 876 | |
| MEET | -3837<br>151 000 | -6934<br>151 000 | -0417<br>151 305 | -1836<br>103 029 | -2043<br>103 019 | -1131<br>103 127 | -1558<br>103 059 | -1668<br>90 058 | 9020<br>151 000 | 7935<br>151 000 | 923 | | |
| DISC | -4453<br>151 000 | -7663<br>151 000 | -0720<br>151 000 | -0677<br>103 248 | -1167<br>103 120 | -0003<br>103 498 | -0568<br>103 294 | -1514<br>90 077 | 9056<br>151 000 | 921 | | | |
| PRCA24 | -4559<br>151 000 | -7616<br>151 000 | -0897<br>151 141 | -0895<br>103 184 | -1594<br>103 055 | -0165<br>103 434 | -0623<br>103 266 | -1341<br>90 104 | 954 | | | | |
| S-M | -0650<br>135 227 | 1211<br>135 081 | -1544<br>135 037 | -0962<br>92 181 | -0056<br>92 479 | -1032<br>92 164 | -1080<br>92 153 | 653 | | | | | |
| ATT | 2885<br>152 000 | 2297<br>152 002 | 2126<br>152 004 | 8322<br>152 000 | 5325<br>152 000 | 4893<br>152 000 | 785 | | | | | | |
| PERC | 2034<br>152 006 | 2304<br>152 002 | 1074<br>152 094 | 7838<br>152 000 | 6221<br>152 000 | 893 | | | | | | | |
| RESP | 3352<br>152 000 | 3693<br>152 000 | 1834<br>152 000 | 8111<br>152 000 | 874 | | | | | | | | |
| IIS | 3316<br>152 000 | 3182<br>152 000 | 2108<br>152 004 | 919 | | | | | | | | | |
| CPO | 8821<br>491 000 | 1353<br>491 001 | 783 | | | | | | | | | | |
| CPS | 5961<br>491 000 | 905 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| COMMOTIV | 977 | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | VAR1 |
|---|---|
| VAR2 | r<br>n p |

Notes:

Diagonal elements are the $\alpha$ coefficients.

Probability values are one-tailed.

COMMOTIV (Communicator Motivation): Concern for Promoting Self + Concern for Promoting Other
IIS (Interaction Involvement Scale): RESPonsiveness + PERCeptiveness + ATTentiveness
S-M (Self-monitoring scale)
PRCA24 (Personal Report of Communication Apprehension-24): DISCussions + MEETings + CONVersations + public SPEaKing